

TRANSCRIPT PREPARED BY THE CLERK OF THE LEGISLATURE
Transcriber's Office
FLOOR DEBATE

February 22, 2005 LB 570

SENATOR LANDIS: To the extent that we need to enforce the statutes of the United States government and the federal code, this, this law, will be sublimated to that. And it's also the case that this code will be sublimated to a regulatory statute of our state designed to essentially regulate these kinds of relationships or transactions. If, for example, there's a commercial code in here, but if we adopted a regulatory statute that allowed for a three-day cooling-off period, that would govern.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR CUDABACK: Time.

SENATOR LANDIS: Exactly. Now, maybe it's the word "applicable." My light is on. I'll continue if I...is my light the next one?

SENATOR CUDABACK: You may. Your light is next, Senator.

SENATOR LANDIS: Thank you. Let's continue this exchange if we could, because I certainly don't want to cut Senator Chambers off. It may be in the word "applicable" that you find the problem, because if it was "conflict," you wouldn't have any problem with that because that would be stating textbook federalism.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Right.

SENATOR LANDIS: And I wonder if the word "applicable" is there is because how you use the term "treaty." You may not...maybe that's the better verb.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Why do we...

SENATOR LANDIS: However, if you'd like to consider the use of the verb "conflict" rather than "applicable," I would consider that between now and Select File.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: And I'm not going to offer an amendment. And